DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 636 95 SP 011 404

AUTHOR Bystydzienski, Jill M.; And Others
TITLE Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs. Vol. 2, Process Environment.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Teacher Education Developmental Service.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT 300-76-0034
NOTE 59p.; For related documents, see SP011 401-409 and SP011 542

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; *Environmental Influences; Information Networks; Participant Satisfaction; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *State Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Morale; Unions
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This document examines three process environment factors (communications networks, morale of consortia members, and teacher's union attitudes) and their influence on the responses of educational institutions to a New York State Department of Education mandate on performance based teacher education (PBTE). In studying the communications networks, the research focused upon three aspects: (1) formal vs. informal, (2) availability of information, and (3) centralized vs. decentralized networks. It appeared that formal communications networks helped somewhat in receiving a four-year program registration as did high availability of information concerning PBTE. The data seemed to indicate no relationship between the degree of centralization and whether a four-year or one-year registration was received. Morale and compliance with the mandate were looked at in terms of five areas related to satisfaction felt by members of the consortium and initial resistance of individuals to the PBTE mandate. Research in this area was inconclusive. Data seemed to support a relationship between cooperation of local teacher unions and four-year program registration. More general findings, as background for further research, include: (1) major objectives of the PBTE groups participating in this study were reported to be a) assistance to universities in the development and implementation of PBTE programs, b) meeting the state mandate on PBTE, and c) obtaining registration for the given programs; (2) PBTE group members were involved to a degree that they collectively found satisfactory in establishing requisite group objectives; and (3) implementation of proposals is a key area of concern to respondents in the survey. (MJB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affect quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (ED EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made f the original.

Factors Affecting The Institutional Development of CBTE Programs / vol. 2

ED143636

Process Environment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Jill M. Bystydzienski
Charles R. Hancock
Joseph A. Scimecca
Jenifer Whittle

Teacher Education Developmental Service / John Ether, Director

Spring 1976

State University of New York at Albany

SP011 404

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

ED143636

Preface

In July 1970, Teacher Corps requested all 5th cycle programs to begin developing Competence-Based Teacher Education programs. In July 1971, Teacher Corps required that all programs funded be competence-based. Since that time, Teacher Corps has been a major force in the development, demonstration and implementation of CBTE.

In 1972, the New York State Board of Regents set, as a goal, the establishment of teacher certification that ensures possession and maintenance of demonstrated competence on the part of teachers. The movement to CBTE in New York State should be completed by 1980.

These two facts come together quite naturally.

"What can be learned from the experiences in New York State as the transition is made? What help can be provided educational leaders in all other parts of the nation as a result of the New York State experience?"

We at the State University of New York at Albany were given the opportunity to attempt a response to those questions. An inter-disciplinary group of faculty and advanced graduate students in the School of Education accepted that responsibility. This volume is one of eight written as a result of that acceptance. Details are given in the Introduction that follows.

SP 011 404

Directing and coordinating this effort has been one of the most exciting experiences of my professional life. Acknowledgements are too extensive to attempt. Suffice it to say that cooperation of faculty, students, people from so many campuses in the State, our support staff, etc. was truly phenomenal.

One exception must be made. Without the herculean efforts and high level talent of Ms. Kathy Cooke, we would still be in formative stages.

It is our hope that we have, indeed, provided information to help educational leaders throughout the nation to judiciously consider CBTE and, if appropriate, to successfully implement that system.

John A. Ether
Professor of Education
Project Director

Table of Contents

Page

I. Introduction to the TEDS Research Project.....1
History of CBTE in New York State.....2
Statement of the Problem.....3
Purpose.....5
Focus.....5
Population.....6
Sample.....6
Data Collection.....8
Summary.....8

II. Process Environment Factors Affecting Instructional Development of CBTE Programs

Introduction.....9
Findings.....14
General Findings.....26
Summary and Recommendations for Further Study.....32

Appendix A
Glossary of Terms

Appendix B
Responding Institutions
Number of Responses by Category
Chart - Responses per Institution by Role

Appendix C
Questionnaire

This document consists of material prepared under Contract No. 300-76-0034, National Teacher Corps.

Introduction to the TEDS Research Project

In August 1975 the Teacher Education Developmental Service began a study designed to document the process of program development in teacher training institutions in New York State responding to a statewide mandate for Competence Based Teacher Education. This comprehensive study was completed in July 1976. The efforts of six professors and five research associates from various disciplines in the School of Education were combined to carry out the study. Six reports resulted from the study.

1. "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research
2. "Process Environment Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
3. "Organizational Change Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
4. "Decision Making Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs.
5. "Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
6. "Technical Assistance Factors Affecting Institutional." Development of CBTE Programs.

HISTORY OF CBTE IN NEW YORK STATE

During the past forty years much change has taken place in the regulation of teacher preparation and certification practices in New York State. Mandatory requirement of a baccalaureate degree for most public school teachers was established in 1936. In 1943, the fifth year requirement was enacted for secondary and special certificates; in 1963 this was extended to elementary certificates. Certification has been granted by the State to students successfully completing an accredited academic program.

Recently the 1972 New York Board of Regents published "Education Beyond High School; the Regents Tentative Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education". That document cited changes in the economic, cultural and educational sectors of society that necessitated a re-evaluation of teacher preparation programs. The Regents goal for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the school is:

> To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the school possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

The Regents intended this goal to be implemented in Competency Based Teacher Education programs, with the state maintaining ultimate control through its program registration system.

Groundwork toward a competency-based teacher preparation program was laid in 1971 when 12 field-based trial projects dealing with program revision were sanctioned and supported by the New York State Department of Education. The projects included faculty and staff from public schools and colleges and teachers in training who identified school goals, relevant teacher competencies, evidence that such competencies are influentical and training programs to develop those competencies. These trial projects were continued and became models for the institutions now involved in re-writing teacher education programs in a competency-based mode. Other models, including the various Teacher Corps programs, were being developed and tested during the same period.

To implement the goal of state-wide competency based teacher education, a series of regional meetings were held in 1973, outlining new procedures and standards for state certification. A time line for program registration was established, beginning in 1976 for certain elementary certifications, concluding in 1980 with a competency based program for school administrators.

The first round of program submissions was completed in February, 1975. This research report concerns those institutions involved in meeting the February, 1975 deadline.

Statement of the Problem:

What are the processess involved in institutions of higher education and their consortia as they responed to a New York State mandate for CBTE?

The February, 1975 deadline for programs in elementary education, special education of the deaf and blind, and speech-hearing education marked the first mandate change toward Competency-Based Teacher Training in New York State. One hundred and forty-three teacher training programs in sixty institutions were required to respond to this deadline by submitting teacher training programs for program registration to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification. Due to the wide variety of institutional settings and characteristics represented by this group of teacher training institutions, responses to the state mandate took varying forms. Despite these differences in institutional settings and characteristics, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was confronted with the problem of applying and developing standardized criteria upon which to base decisions regarding program registration. It is from these two phenomona; 1) the variations in institutional setting and characteristics, and; 2) the Division's state-wide mandate and standardized criteria for program development and registration, that the problem which this study addresses eminates.

This study concerns itself with the first part of the problem: the process of developing CBTE programs in sixty institutions in New York State with varying institutional settings and differing organizational, social, and physical characteristics.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to: 1) identify, 2) describe, and 3) compare the characteristics (elements or factors) of the process of designing CBTE program proposals in various institutions in New York State as they responded to a state-wide mandate for CBTE.

Focus

The study focused upon those institutions which:

1) were to submit teacher training program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. These include programs for the preparation of teachers in the following subject areas:

   a. N-6
   b. Special Education
   c. 7-9
   d. Speech-Hearing
   e. Deaf
   f. Blind

2) received one-year and/or four-year registration of their program proposals from the State Education Dept., division of Teacher Education and certification,

3) met the creteria set by the researchers regarding institutions, and whether or not they were public or private institutions containing appropriate programs, and,

4) indicated a willingness to participate in the study by allowing administration of questionnaires. It should be noted that the state mandate places Responsibility for program design upon the institutions of higher education. However, the mandate also requires that the institutions design the programs by collaborating with school district personnel and personnel from appropriate professional agencies. This collabortive group is known as the consortium and becomes the focal point for data collection in the study. The consortium also included sub groupings termed the Policy Board and Task Force whose behavior and involvement in the process will be analyzed.

Population

The population for this study consisted of those institutions which were required to submit CBTE program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. Sixty institutions fell into this category encompassing one hundred forty-six teacher training programs. These programs proposed to train elementary school teachers in the following areas:

1. N-6 (81)
2. Speech Hearing (25)
3. 7-9 (6)
4. Deaf (3)
5. Blind (1)
6. SpecialEducation (30)

146

Sample

The researchers assumed that factors of institutional size and whether or not institutions were publicly or privately funded could provide a basis for comparison. Also, two categories were formed on the basis of whether or not institutions received one year or four year registration from the SED. Comparisons are made on the basis of these categories of analysis in each report. The categories formed on the basis of these criteria (size, funding, and registration) follow:

One year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
small	4

Four year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
Small	4

There was an insufficient number of small institutions to categorize them into private or public categories. One category had only four institutions and therefore the decision was made to place four institutions in each category to insure a balanced response from all categories. Initially, institutions to be placed in the remaining categories were chosen to insure the widest possible geographical dispersion throughout the state. Some institutions declined participation in the study. Back-up institutions were also selected on the basis of geographical dispersion and availabliilty.

An additional categroy of institutions was constructed from institutions which submitted two programs which received differing program registration (1 year or 4 year). This was done to provide a comparison of one and four year program development within institutions. This categroy was divided into public and private institutions.

One and four year registration

Public	(4)
Private	(4)

As a result of these categories and the necessity to place four institutions in each category thirty two institutions comprised the sample.

Eighteen of the 32 institutions responded.

Eight individuals at each institutions were identified according to role. These roles were identified in order to allow for a representative sample of all groups involved in the development of the CBTE program. The individuals identified were as follows:

--School of Education Dean or Department Chairman
--Public School Principal on the Policy Board
--Public School Teacher on the Policy Board
--College Faculty Member on the Policy Board
--Task Force Chairman
--Task Force Member from public school
--Task Force Member from college faculty
--Chairman of Policy Board

Each individual described above was given one questionnaire specifically disigned for his role. (For further information see Appendix B)

Data Collection

Due to the complex nature of the data the difficulties in the logistics of data collection, the decision was made to collect data through a questionnaire. Whenever possible (twenty seven of the thirty two institutions) the questionnaire was administered by one of the researchers at a meeting of the individuals filling out the questionnaire. The data gathered was either brought back by the researcher or mailed in by the respondents. Thus, the majority of the data was collected through on-site visitations.

Summary

The information presented in this section of the report is provided to introduce and explain the context and conduct of the comprehensive study. More specific information regarding the entire study is available in Report #1, "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."

Process Environment Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs

Introduction

As was stated in Section 1 of this report, assumptions were made by the researchers that institutional size and the public or private nature of the educational institutions submitting program proposals to the New York State Education Department 1972 CBTE mandate would affect whether an institution would receive a one year or four year program registration.

Before presenting the findings, however, certain preliminary statements are in order. Given that only 18 of the original 32 institutions chosen in our sample responded, and that not all of these responses were completed, any generalizations made must be taken as extremely tentative. This study, then, is to be seen as an exploration into certain factors, "process environment factors" (these will be defined more fully below), and how they affected responses by selected educational institutions to the CBTE mandate. What is presented is an exploratory study of how certain institutions of higher education responded to mandated educational change.

*An in depth analysis of one of the four institutions which did not receive either a four year or a one year certification is in preparation and will also be published by TEDS.

This section of the report is divided into two parts. One is a specific analysis of the data by institution with regard to one year or four year program registration. The second is an overview analysis across institutions for large vs small categories.

Because the consortia were formal organizations they developed structures for the attainment of goals or objectives in accord with their interpretation of the mandate. As organizations, the consortia might differ along several dimensions of structure, nevertheless, they would have certain factors of organization in common. And while the variables or factors of organization are many (see in particular Hage and Aiken, 1970 and March, 1965), the ones which were focused upon as relevant were 1) the communications networks established and 2) the morale of individual consortia members. A third factor, the role of teachers unions was also looked at given the particular feature of the CBTE mandate which asked for the cooperation of local teachers unions, and the fact that Thomas Hobart and Albert Shanker, speaking for New York State United Teachers, came out against CBTE. These three factors, then, make up what we are calling "process environment factors".

Before presenting the findings in relation to these variables a brief description of each process environment factor is given below.

Communications Networks - Communications are central phenomena in any organization. When one conceives of an organization as an ever changing system of interaction, it must be noted that communications aid in the development and maintenance of organizational purposes as members motivate and inspire each other toward goal accomplishments. Structures are differentiated within the organization into subunits with each specializing in its own activities, and using communications in coordinating their outputs. (Guetzkow, 1970: 534) Communications networks are seen as either formal or informal. For our purposes, consortia which had highly established channels of communication (memos, meetings, etc.) were defined as having highly formalized communications networks. Those consortia which relied on informal ways of obtaining information (interpersonal discussions, non-structured sharing of information and materials on CBTE) were defined as informal. A further differentiation concerns the degree of availability of information. Using responses to questions 27 - 30 (see appendix C) we were able to ascertain whether or not there was a high, medium or low amount of information available to CBTE members. Lastly, we looked at the degree to which the communications networks were centralized or decentralized. Responses to questions 31 - 36 (see appendix C) were used to determine whether or not communications networks were diffused (decentralized) or were characterized by controlled information flow (centralized).

In sum, the research focused upon three aspects of the communications networks established by consortia as they organized to meet the CBTE mandate. These three were 1) formal vs. informal, 2) availability of information, and 3) centralized vs. decentralized.

Morale - This is the human dimension of organizations and refers to the degree of satisfaction incumbents of position experience while participating in the organization. Morale is a somewhat difficult aspect of organizations to study and is usually associated with salary, type of work, and regulations. Given the history of autonomy that members of higher educational institutions have enjoyed, the choice was made to concentrate upon individual's statements about their feelings concerning their participation in the development of the policy within their respective consortium. Morale was thus defined as the degree of satisfaction experienced by consortium members with participation in policy formation.

The concept was further operationalized in terms of five areas with questions #4, 5, 6, 18, 22 (see appendix C) designed to measure each. These areas are:

1. The respondent's degree of satisfaction with regard to his/her involvement to establishing objectives. (question #4)
2. The respondent's degree of satisfaction with regard to others' involvement in establishing objectives. (question #5)
3. The respondent's degree of satisfaction with the group's objectives. (question #6)

4. Whether or not the respondent felt effective in policy matters related to CBTE. (question #18)

5. Whether or not the respondent felt he/she understood his/her role within the group. (question #22)

Somewhat related to morale, but not synonymous with it, was the initial resistance of individuals to the CBTE mandate. Given the highly controversial nature of the mandate, it was decided to focus upon the resistance of individuals to what they might very well see as a restriction upon their academic freedom. The CBTE mandate was a restriction because it was a mandated change and it employed only one model for teacher preparation in New York State.

Role of the Local Teachers Union - The New York State local teachers unions are represented in the membership of the consortium. As was stated previously, this organization was one which assumed a position against the mandate. Thus, it was felt that one would gain a greater insight into the overall response of educational institutions by focusing upon the role that teachers unions played in meeting the CBTE mandate.

Of specific interest was the manner and degree of cooperation given by the local teachers unions. This was measured via an analysis of the responses to question #45. (see Appendix C)

Findings

Eight research questions were derived from our initial assumptions concerning the public vs. private, the large vs. small nature of the educational institution, and from the three organizational factors discussed above: 1) communications networks established, 2) morale of individual consortium members and 3) the role of teachers unions.

The research questions and respective findings are as follows.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Does the private or public nature of an institution affect its compliance with the CBTE mandate?

The data seem to show that there is no relationship between the public or private nature of an institution and its one year or four year program registration. Of the 6 public institutions surveyed, 3 received four year registration and 3 received one year registration. On the other hand 6 of the 12 private institutions received four year registration and 6 achieved one year registration.

TABLE 1

Public vs. Private and Program Registration

	Public	Private
Four year registration	3	6
One year registration	3	6

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: Does the size of the institution affect its compliance with the CBTE mandate?

Size also seems to be as inconclusive as the private or public nature of the institution. Of the 13 institutions defined as large, 7 received four year program registration and 6 received one year registration. As for small institutions, 2 of the five received four year registration and the remaining 3 received one year. While the latter percentage figures might appear to be significant, (40% of the small institutions received four year registration and 60% of the large received one year registration), the size of the sample precludes any generalizations.

TABLE 2

Size and Program Registration

	Large	Small
Four year registration	7	2
One year registration	6	3

Combining the categories into public large, private large and private small (we had no responses in the public small category) also seems to show no relationship. Of the 6 public large institutions, 3 received four year registration and 3 received one year registration. Of the 7 private large institutions 4 received four year registration 3 received one year. And of the 5 private small institutions, 3 received

four year registration and 2 received one year.

TABLE 3

Public vs. Private, Size and Program Registration

	Public Large	Private Large	Private Small
Four year registration	3	4	3
One year registration	3	3	2

In sum, then, our initial assumption concerning the relationship of public vs. private with four year or one year program registration and large vs. small with four year or one year registration do not seem to be borne out by our data.

Research Questions 3, 4, and 5 flowed from our concern with the communications networks various consortia formulated to meet the mandate.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: Does the degree to which communications networks are formalized affect compliance with the CBTE mandate?

As was stated before, when a consortium developed highly established channels of communication in the form of memos and scheduled meetings, it was characterized as having a highly formalized communications network. Those which had a few and unscheduled meetings and very few memos were labeled as informal. Those consortia which fell in between the two were characterized as having a medium formalized communications network.

It was found that there seemed to be a relationship between the type of communications channels established and program registration with regard to the CBTE mandate. Of the 5 institutions characterized as having a formal communications network, 3 received 4 year registration and 2 received one year registration. Of the 5 institutions labeled medium, 3 received a four year registration and 2 received one year registration. However, only 3 of the 8 characterized as developing an informal communications network fell into the four year category while 5 fell into the category of one year registration. It would

seem then that formal communications networks did seem to help some in receiving four year registration, while informal communications networks were a slight hindrance. Again we must caution against infering too much from this data.

TABLE 4

Formal Communications Networks and Program Registration

	Formal	Medium	Informal
Four year registration	#3	3	3
One year registration	2	2	5

RESEARCH QUESTION 4: Does the degree of availability of information affect compliance with the CBTE mandate?

Based upon answers to questions which asked about engagement in discussions, sources of information available on CBTE, use of these materials, and difficulty obtaining available resources, consortium were characterized as having high and low availability of information on CBTE.

The data seem to indicate there is a relationship between availability of information concerning CBTE and four year program registration in regard to the CBTE mandate. Eight of the 9 consortia receiving four year registration had a great deal of information available to them, while only 5 of the 9 which received one year registration could be characterized as having high availability. It seems then that making information available to consortia helped in achieving a four year registration.

TABLE 5

Availability of Information and Program Registration

	High	Low
Four year registration	8	5
One year registration	1	4

RESEARCH QUESTION 5: Does the degree of centralization in communication networks affect compliance with the CBTE mandate?

Consortia which developed communications networks which were characterized as diffused, as having informal communication channels set up and which made information on CBTE easily available to its members were considered to have a decentralized communication network. Those consortia which had formal, controlled communications channels and which did not make information on CBTE easily available were considered to be centralized.

The data seem to indicate that there was no relationship between the degree of centralization and whether a four year or one year program registration was received. Of the 10 consortia considered to be decentralized 5 received four year registration and 5 received one year registration. Of the 8 considered to have a centralized communication network 4 were registered for four years and 4 were registered for one year.

TABLE 6

Degree of Centralization and Program Registration

	Centralized	De-Centralized
Four year registration	4	5
One year registration	4	5

RESEARCH QUESTION 6: Does the degree of morale within consortia affect compliance with the mandate?

As was stated previously, morale is viewed in terms of the degree of satisfaction which was felt by members of the consortium. The following five areas of group satisfaction were identified.

1. The respondent's degree of satisfaction with regard to his/her involvement in establishing objectives.
2. The respondent's degree of satisfaction with regard to others involvement in establishing objectives.
3. The respondent's degree of satisfaction with the group's objectives.
4. Whether or not the respondent felt effective in policy matters related to CBTE.
5. Whether or not the respondent felt he/she understood his/her role within the group.

One might expect that high morale and satisfaction might lead to better group functioning and thus facilitate the submission of a proposal to the State Education Department, which would be registered for four years.

Sections 1, 2, 3 were measured on a Likert scale of 1-5 with 1 indicating low and 5 indicating high. In coding each of the areas, a response of 1 or 2 was indicative of low satisfaction, three was neutral, and 4 and 5 indicated high satisfaction. Sections 4 and 5 were measured by a count of the number of "yes" responses with 0-39% indicative of low satisfaction, 40-59% indicating medium satisfaction, and 60-100% high satisfaction.

The responses to each area were then charted by institution so that the total measure of the degree of morale in a particular institution could be obtained. A high score in 3 of the 5 areas was indicative of high morale, a medium score in 3 out of 5 indicative of medium and likewise for low morale. Once these measures were computed, the degree of morale for each institution was compared to the breakdown into one and four year program registration to see whether or not morale affected compliance with the CBTE mandate.

The data were not conclusive in this regard. Of the 11 institutions which showed a high level of morale, 4 received four year registration and 7 received one year registration. Of the 4 institutions which fell into the medium range 3 received four year registration and 1 received a one year registration. Of interest, however, with regard to the research question is the fact that of the 2 institutions which fell into the low morale classification, both received only a one year registration. Due to limited response rates, however, a conclusive statement with regard to morale and its effect on compliance with the mandate cannot be made.

TABLE 7

Morale and Program Registration

	High	Medium	Low
	60-100%	40-59%	0-39%
Four year registration	4	3	0
One year registration	7	1	2

RESEARCH QUESTION 7: Does initial resistance to the concept of CBTE affect the likelihood of four year program registration?

The data do not seem to support any relationship between initial resistance and four year program registration. Categorizing institutions as manifesting high, medium and low initial resistance to CBTE (based on analysis of respondent's answer to question 40) it was found that 2 of the 4 categorized as highly resistant received four year registration and the other 2 received one year. Six of the 10 categorized as neutral received four year registration while the remaining 4 received one year. And finally, only 1 of the 4 categorized as low in resistance received four year registration and the other 3 received one year. If anything, low resistance correlates negatively with four year program registration.

TABLE 8

Initial Resistance to CBTE and Program Registration

	High	Neutral	Low
Four year registration	2	6	1
One year registration	2	4	3

RESEARCH QUESTION 8: Did local teachers unions affect compliance with the CBTE mandate?

The data seem to support a relationship between cooperation of local teachers unions and four year program registration. The unions were labeled as cooperative, moderately cooperative, and uncooperative. Eight of 11 of those institutions which dealt with cooperative unions received four year registration whereas 1 of 6 of the institutions which encountered either uncooperative or moderately cooperative unions received four year registration as they sought to write a CBTE program.

TABLE 9

Teacher Union Cooperation and Program Registration

	Cooperative	Limited Cooperation	Uncooperative
Four year registration	8	1	0
One year registration	3	2	4

General Findings

Given the limited number of institutions analyzed and the problems inherent in generalizing from such a limited sample, certain more general information derived from the questionnaire might be helpful to future researchers who seek to understand the process environment factors which affect the institutionalization of CBTE in New York State. In particular this section will concentrate on the perceived objectives of the respondents.

A rating scale was constructed to help identify participants' degrees of involvement in establishing the objectives as well as their satisfaction with them. Guiding questions were also included in the questionnaire in an effort to obtain additional, specific information from respondents. An analysis of the responses to both the rating scales and the open-ended items is included. While it was anticipated that analyses would be completed for both public and private institutions with the additional descriptors (small and large), it was not possible in this section where the number of respondents was very small in some cases and very unequal in other cases. With the exception of several cases, the analyses which follow are collective responses, with a total N=71, as indicated.

An analysis of the perceived objectives of the group(s) to which the respondents belonged revealed the following items. The listing which follows is a combined ordering, by frequency

of mention, for both public and private institutions represented in the sample:

OBJECTIVE	FREQUENCY
1) To assist the university in developing and implementing a CBTE Program	37
2) To be involved with the university	17
3) To develop (and infer) competencies	15
4) To meet New York State Education Dept. Mandate	13
5) To design and evaluate a system of teacher training	12
6) To improve interaction among students/teachers/ schools/universities	12
7) To design assessment strategies	11
8) To improve teacher training	11
9) To improve the teaching/learning process	11
10) To develop programs which are field-based	8
11) To enhance faculty growth	8
12) To protect interests of currently employed teachers	8

Several objectives were identified by only one respondent; these are indicated below:

1) To develop modules

2) To develop a theory of education

3) To obtain registration for all teacher education programs at this university

4) To establish task groups for each program

5) To try novel organizational strategies

It is noteworthy that these objectives were identified by respondents as their perception of their task(s). Since the

N of responses is 71 and since the caution mentioned throughout this report is assumed to be valid, the limit to which generalizations from this can be made should be obvious; these are the collective responses to an important but elusive area - statement of objectives. An examination of these statements also reveals that they are not discrete. Despite these cautions, however, a combination of Items 1 and 4 (first group) and Item 3 (second group) reveals 72% of the total response. This suggests that well over a majority of the respondents consider their essential task to be the development of a program which is acceptable to New York State Education Department.

The respondents were requested to rate their involvement in the establishment of the objectives which they identified. The result was a high degree of involvement as was clearly indicated by a 77% positive response to this item. Similarly, a positive response of 76% revealed that respondents were satisfied with their degree of involvement in establishing the CBTE group objectives. When asked to rate their satisfaction with the degree of involvement of other people, the percentage of positive responses was 75. Even among these positive findings, however, one frequently found comments such as the following unedited ones:

-"Could have involved parents and more elementary teachers" (Small private institution respondent)

-"The faculty and administration would be more amenable to CBTE now if it had been involved in some education about specific instructional objectives, assessment, etc." (Large public institution respondent)

When asked to indicate if the initial objectives of the CBTE group had changed in any way (i.e. after the group had been in operation awhile), 58% of the respondents gave a negative response and 28% suggested a positive response. The remaining 14% of the respondents either responded "don't know" or failed to respond to this item.

The perceived distinctions with regard to objectives between the CBTE group(s) at various institutions and those of the CBTE mandate from New York State Education Department were of interest to the investigators in this study. Two items were included in the questionnaire as evidence of this interest. Such distinctions failed to emerge, however, after a careful analysis of the items in question. Perhaps the global nature of the objectives in these cases obfuscated inherent distinctions. Perhaps it is a contradiction of terms to anticipate a distinction between the two sets of objectives. Whatever the reason, the current analysis of the data did not reveal such a distinction. On the other hand, interpolation of the data permits the researchers to conclude that the question is not one of agreement/disagreement or similarity/dissimilarity of objectives, but, rather, that it is a question of implementation. The following unedited citations illustrate the point:

-"The rationale of preparing teachers with teaching skills in a sequential manner looks good - if implementation follows, it's even better." (Large private institution respondent)

-"Many problems seen with implementing many objectives." (Large private institution)

-"Long overdue, however, the State has offered little help to colleges and school districts in implementation phase" (Small private institution respondent)

-"I can understand the goals, but here at (name of institution omitted) the method (mandate deadlines, etc.) defeated them." (Large public institution respondent)

An analysis of the data revealed that 52% of the respondents were not able to discern any changes in the initial interpretations of the CBTE Mandate (i.e., after the consortium had been under way for awhile). Positive responses were indicated by 19% of the respondents, while 28% failed to complete this item. One might conclude that there were not significant differences between the initial objectives of the CBTE Mandate and subsequent statements issued by the **New York State Education** Department, at least in the minds of most of the respondents in this survey.

In short, an examination and analysis of responses to items pertaining to objectives of the CBTE groups and CBTE Mandate from **New York State Education Department reveal substantial agreement in the following areas:**

1. **The major objectives of the CBTE groups participating in this study were reported to be: 1) assisting the university (in the case of each CBTE group) to develop and implement a CBTE program; 2) meeting the New York State Education Department Mandate; and 3) obtaining registration for the given program.**

2. CBTE group members were involved to a degree which they collectively found satisfactory in establishing requisite group objectives.

3. Implementation of proposals is a key area of concern among respondents in this survey. Even in the face of mutually acceptable goals, excellent rapport among the various constituencies, and ultimate acceptance of a CBTE mode of instruction, the constraints of the local situation were found to be frequently mentioned as problems in implementing CBTE programs.

Summary and Recommendations for Further Study

An analysis of the data from the 18 institutions responding to the questionnaire seemed to show that either the size or the private vs. public funding nature of educational institutions seeking to comply with the CBTE mandate affect the achievement of a four year or one year registration was not borne out. These categories were useful however in the initial selection of the sample. Therefore, any conclusive statements regarding the first two research questions cannot be made.

In terms of the three organizational factors studied: communications networks established, morale of individual consortium members, and cooperation of local teachers unions, there were mixed results. Although the data seemed to show relationships in only two of the remaining research questions, it did serve to point out areas for further research. The findings, which are tentative and exploratory at best, can be summarized as follows:

1. The more information available, the greater the likelihood of four year registration (research question #4).
2. The greater the cooperation of local teachers unions, the greater the likelihood of four year registration (research question #8).

Based upon these findings, further questions dealing with the implementation of a program to facilitate the process of organizational change with regard to CBTE manifest themselves.

While this study obtained preliminary statements with regard to availability of information, one might further investigate the best types of information, the best sources of this information, and also methods for its distribution. Secondly, given the position of teachers unions, one might look at information exchange between teachers unions and State Education Department or other groups involved in the total CBTE change process. An investigation of the reactions on the part of the unions in terms of communication, information exchange, and problems might also prove interesting.

While findings on morale and the initial resistance to the mandate did not lead to any conclusive statements, these areas are nevertheless of importance. Perhaps a look at the reasons for low morale and resistance, not in terms of one year or four year program registration but rather in general terms, would prove more beneficial. As was pointed out in the general findings, there was concern with the implementation of Competence-Based Teacher Education. Thus, perhaps the respondents did not resist the actual writing of competencies but their resistance was centered around the future implementation of the CBTE program. One interesting way to group the data would be on the basis of the various constituencies represented by the consortium, especially the teachers union, given the findings.

The above are some suggested areas for further study. Given the fact that CBTE has only recently begun to affect teacher training, the range of possibilities for further study is almost endless. A systematic and continuing research-based study of CBTE, of realities which institutions must face (including budgetary, personnel, parity) in implementing proposals, and of alternative modes of certification should be conducted, particularly in light of the data analysis in this study.

REFERENCES

Burns, T. and G.M. Stalken. The Management of Innovation. London: Tavistock, 1961.

Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1964.

Guetzkow, H. "Communications in Organizations." Pp. 534-573 in J. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally Company, 1965.

Hage, J. and M. Aiken. Social Change in Complex Organizations. New York: Random House, 1970.

Hall, R. The Formal Organization. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

March, J. (ed.) Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally Company, 1965.

Mott, P.E. The Characteristics of Effective Organizations. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Perrow, C. Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Price, J.L. (ed.) Handbook of Organizational Measurement. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1972.

Roth, R.A. "The Role of the State in Performance-Based Teacher Education Certification." Pp. 1-11 in T. Anderson (ed.) Assessment. Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, 1972.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Due to the wide variety of approaches taken throughout the state in developing the CBTE format, it is necessary to standardize the following terms to insure consistencey in collection and interpretation of responses.

1. Consortium- The collective entity comprised of the agencies and institutions involved in developing the CBTE program. The consortia might include; Teachers' Unions, Community Organizations, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), School Districts, etc.

2. Policy Board- Group which coordinates and/or directs the activitites of the consortia membership as the CBTE format is developed. The Policy Board consists of representatives of the groups who participate in the Consortium.

3. Task Force- Group responsible specifically for the development of the program proposal. Task Force usually consists of members of the various organizations in the consortia who have an interest or expertise in a specific educational area. For instance, a Task Force on elementary education might consist of two faculty members from a university, three elementary school teachers, and two parents.

4. IHE- This refers to the Institution of Higher Education involved in the consortium.

5. Mandate- The provisions of Education Law #6842 and the criteria establised by the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification which outlined the competency-based requirements for program registration with the State Education Department.

6. School District- School District involved in the consortium.

7. Professional Agency- This usually refers to the Teachers' Union involved in the consortium.

8. Program Proposal- Document submitted, by the IHE and consortia, to the State Education Department for registration.

9. Program Registration- Refers to the State Education Department's decision to register a program for one year or four years.

NOTE: All programs and program proposals, forming the focal point of this study, were to be submitted to the State Education Department on or before February 1, 1975. These include:

N-6	Deaf
Speech-Hearing	Blind
Special Education	7-9

APPENDIX B

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Adelphi University
SUNY Albany
Alfred University
SUC Brockport
Dowling College
Fordham University
Ithaca College
Keuka College
Kirkland College
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman
LIU Southampton
Marymount College
Nazareth College
SUC New Paltz
SUC Potsdam
St. John's University
Syracuse University
Vassar College

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORY

Program Registration	Type of Institution	Number of Responding Institutions
1 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
4 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
1 and 4 year program registration	Public	1
	Private	1

INSTITUTION	DEAN	TEACHER POLICY BOARD	PRINCIPAL POLICY BOARD	COLLEGE FACULTY POLICY BOARD	CHAIRPERSON POLICY BOARD	TASK CHAIRPERSON	PUBLIC SCHOOL TASK	COLLEGE TASK
1	X				X		X	X
2	X			X	X	X		X
3	X	X	X	X			X	
4		X	X		X	X	X	X
5	X		X	X		X		X
6	X		X	X			X	X
7	X		X		X	X		
8	X		X				X	
9	X			X				
10					X			
11	X	X		X				
12		X						
13	X		X	X	X		X	X
14		X	X	X			X	X
15		X	X		X	X	X	X
16								
17	X	X	X	X			X	
18	X	X		X		X		X

Responses per Institution by Role - Technical Assistance

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Answer all questions on the basis of your involvement in the process of developing the CBTE program proposal submitted in February 1975.

2. If you served in developing two different program proposals i.e. N-6 and Special Education, try to limit your responses to those relevant to the specific program in question.

3. We are interested in your perceptions of the roles played by yourself and others. Respondents' identities will not be recorded.

This document contains the following sub-sections.

1. Leadership
2. Decision Making
3. Technical Assistance
4. Process Environment
5. Organizational Change

PROCESS ENVIRONMENT

1. Please list the objectives as you see them of the group(s) to which you belong.

   a) _____

   b) _____

   c) _____

   d) _____

   e) _____

2. Who (persons and their representative positions) was involved in establishing the objectives?

   a) _____

   b) _____

   c) _____

   d) _____

   e) _____

3. Were you involved in establishing these objectives? YES ___ NO ___

   Please indicate the degree of your involvement in establishing these objectives (circle the correct number)

No Involvement			High Involvement	
1	2	3	4	5

Please explain your involvement.

4. Please indicate the degree to which you were satisfied with your involvement in establishing these objectives. (Circle one)

Low Satisfaction			High Satisfaction	
1	2	3	4	5

Please explain your choice.

5. Please indicate the degree of your satisfaction with the involvement of other people in establishing these objectives. (Circle one)

Low Satisfaction			High Satisfaction	
1	2	3	4	5

Please explain your choice.

6. Please indicate the degree of your satisfaction with the objectives of the group to which you belong.

Low Satisfaction			High Satisfaction	
1	2	3	4	5

Please explain your choice.

7. Have the initial objectives of your group been changed in any way (i.e., after the group had been in operation for a while)? YES ___ NO ___

If YES: a) How have the objectives been changed?

b) Why have they been changed?

c) Who was involved in modifying the objectives?

8. Please list the objectives of the CBTE Mandate as you initially understood them.

1)

2)

3)

9. Please indicate the degree of your satisfaction with the objectives of the CBTE Mandate.

Low Satisfaction			High Satisfaction	
1	2	3	4	5

Please explain your choice.

10. As you understand them have the initial interpretations of the CBTE Mandate been changed in any way (i.e., after the consortium had been in operation for a while)? YES ___ NO ___

11. If YES: a) How has the interpretation of the objectives been changed?

b) Why has it been changed?

c) Who was involved in reinterpreting the objectives? (List persons and representative positions)

12. How was the consortium initially organized?

13. What constituencies did the membership represent?

14. After actual functioning, has the proposed organization of the consortium been revised? YES___ NO___

If YES: a) How does it differ?

b) Who was involved in modifying the original organization? (Persons and representative posistions)

c) Why do you think this change occured?

15. In your opinion were all of the groups affected by CBTE (i.e., teachers, unions, administrators, university faculty, etc.) represented by membership within the consortium (Policy Board/ task groups)? YES___ NO___

16. If YES: 1) Why do you have this opinion?

2) What changes would you make in the representations?

3) How would you make these changes?

4) Do you feel it would be possible to make the changes you propose?

17. If NO: 1) Which groups were excluded?

2) Why do you feel that they were excluded?

3) What changes would you make in the representations?

4) Do you feel it would be possible to make the changes which you propose?

18. Do you feel you had any effect on important policy matter(s) related to CDTE?

If YES: 1) What specific policy matter(s) did you affect?

2) How did this occur?

3) What changes would you make?

4) How would you make these changes?

5) Do you feel it would be possible to make the changes which you propose? Why or why not?

19. If NO: 1) Why do you feel you had no effect?

20. Do you feel others had an important effect on policy matter(s) related to CBTE? YES___ NO___

If YES: 1) Please list persons (and their representative positions) whom you feel most affected policy matters (Add additional lines if you need them.)

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

d) _____

e) _____

2) How did the above people effect policy matters?

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

d) _____

e) _____

3) In what policy matters were the above persons effective?

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

d) _____

e) _____

21. If NO: Please explain why you feel this way.

22. Do you feel that you understand your role as a member of the consortium (policy board, task groups)?

If YES: 1) Briefly explain your role as you see it.

2) How did you learn this role? i.e. How did you learn your duties and responsibilities? Did anyone tell you about them?

23. If NO: 1) Why do you think you do not understand your role?

2) Do you think anything should be done to change this?

3) Do you think anything can be done to change this?

24. In your opinion do others respond to you in your role as you see it? YES___ NO___

If YES: What makes you think this?

25, If NO: 1) Why don't they respond to you in your role as you see it?

2) Do you think anything should be done to change this?

3) Do you think anything can be done to change this?

26. As a member of the Policy Board and/or task group, do (did) you discuss with others how they and you feel about the mandate, proposals, goals, policy, etc.?

If YES: 1) What feelings were (are) discussed?

2) What difference does (did) the discussion make?

3) How did the discussion occur?

4) Please give an example(s) of a discussion which you believe made a difference?

27. If you did not engage in discussion, please explain why not.

28. What sources of information on CBTE were (are) available in in your institution for your use (e.g., written materials, conferences, lectures, consulting services, etc.)?

29. Did you ever make use of any of these sources of information?
YES___ NO___

If YES: 1) Which sources did you use?

2) How did you choose the information you used?

3) For what purpose did you use the information?

4) Please indicate the degree to which you think the information you acquired on CBTE was useful to your understanding of what CBTE is about.

Useless Very Useful
1 2 3 4 5

Explain your choice.

5) Please indicate the degree of difficuluty with which you obtained information on CBTE.

Very Difficult				Easy
1	2	3	4	5

Explain your choice.

30. If NO: Why haven't you used any sources of information?

31. Are there any established procedures by which information is passed on from the Policy Board to the task groups and the task groups to the Policy Board at your institution? YES___ NO___

If YES: What are they?

32. If NO: In your opinion, why isn't information passed back and forth between the Policy Board and task groups?

33. Do members of different task groups communicate with one another in your institution? YES___ NO___ DON'T KNOW___

If YES: How does communication between them occur?

34. If NO: Why isn't there any communication?

35. Do any other established (formal) ways exist within your consortium by which you can obtain information on what goes on, e.g., at Policy Board meetings in relation to CBTE and the State Education Mandate? If so, what are they? (e.g., meetings, inter-group memos, etc.)

36. Are there any other informal ways you can get information about what is going on within the consortium? If so, what are they?

37. Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with the formal available ways of obtaining information.

Low Satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 High Satisfaction

Explain your choice.

38. Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with the informal available ways of obtaining information.

Low Satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 High Satisfaction

Explain your choice.

39. Would you make any changes in relation to how information on what is going on is obtained within your consortiom? YES___ NO___

If YES: What changes?

Do you think it is possible to make these changes?
YES___ NO___

Explain

Perception of CBTE

40. What did you think about CBTE when you first found out about it?

41. Have you since then made use of or have been involved in any of the below (Please check off)?

Various sources of information on CBTE ___

Involvement with the Policy Board ___

Involvement in task group(s) ___

42. If you have made use of available information on CBTE or have been involved in the workshops of the Policy Board and/or task group(s), have any of these experiences added to your understanding of CBTE? YES___ NO___

Explain.

43. What is your opinion of CBTE now?

44. Did the faculty governing body (i.e., Senate) take any stand on the CBTE Mandate? YES___ NO___

If YES: What stand did it take?

45. Did the local teacher's union take any stand on CBTE? YES___ NO___

If YES: What was this stand?

How did you find out about this stand?

46. How would you rank the power of local teachers' union(s)
(For each Union)

	Very Strong				Wea
Union 1	5	4	3	2	1
Union 2	5	4	3	2	1
Union 3	5	4	3	2	1
Union 4	5	4	3	2	1
Union 5	5	4	3	2	1

Add more if necessary.